

MAR 29 2001



UNITED STATES PATENT & TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNDER SECRETARY OF COMMERCE FOR INTELLECTUAL
PROPERTY AND DIRECTOR OF THE UNITED STATES
PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
Washington, D.C. 20231

Christopher John Rudy
209 Huron Ave.
Port Huron, MI 48060

In re Application of
Richard H. Hall et al
Application No. 09/172,577
Filed: October 13, 1998
Attorney Docket No.: Blanket-358
For: INERT GAS BLANKET FOR
PROTECTION FROM OXIDATION


Paper No. 22

RESPONSE TO COMPLAINT
TO THE COMMISSIONER

This is in response to practitioner's letter of complaint to the Commissioner filed January 10, 2001.

Practitioner generally complains about the lateness of actual mailings from the mailroom in comparison to the mailing date on the Office papers. A particular instance in the above-identified application is cited wherein the petition to reset the period for response because of a late mailing was denied. It is also pointed out that the decision denying the request to reset the period for response was mailed a day later than the mailing date stamped on the decision. Practitioner goes on to allege dishonesty on the part of the Office and suggests that the Office "clean house" at the mailroom. Finally, practitioner suggests that the Office revisit the guidelines of the M.P.E.P. (section 710.06) to correct the inequity caused by the late mailing of Office communications.

The Patent and Trademark Office welcomes constructive criticism and desires to excel in customer satisfaction. Accordingly, practitioner's points have been addressed. The clerical staff of Technology Center 3600 has been instructed to review their mailing procedures to insure timely mailing of all Office communications. As to the alleged dishonesty, practitioner is advised that he may be assured that there was no intention to deceive with regard to the timely mailing of Office communications. There is simply no motivation to cheat an applicant out of a few days of response time. Any discrepancies are the result of honest mistakes, and will continue to occur as long as the human factor is in place. Finally, a copy of this letter and the complaint filed January 10, 2001 are being sent to the Editor of the Manual of Patent Examining Procedure for consideration of the request to revisit M.P.E.P. §710.06.


Al Lawrence Smith, Director
Patent Technology Center 3600
(703) 308-1020
Facsimile No.: (703) 306-4597